



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,080	07/30/2003	Adam G. Hanes	1449/5	8470

25297 7590 06/15/2005

JENKINS, WILSON & TAYLOR, P. A.  
3100 TOWER BLVD  
SUITE 1400  
DURHAM, NC 27707

EXAMINER

PETERSON, KENNETH E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/630,080

Applicant(s)

HANES ET AL.

Examiner

Kenneth E. Peterson

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,8,9,12-14,16,23 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,8,9,12-14,16,23 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

1. Claim 12 is objected to because of the following reasons.

Applicant has stated that claim 12 is drawn to a combination of the head assembly and the cutting mechanism. However, the cutting mechanism is still recited as if it were just an intended use. To correct this, on line 6, change "for" to –and--, and on line 1, change "for use with" to –and--.

Appropriate correction is required.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1,2,5,12-14,16,23 and 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Byrne '126, who shows a head assembly having a 1<sup>st</sup> lateral wall (e.g. 35 or 16 or 48 or 55), a 1<sup>st</sup> transverse shield wall (e.g. 20 or 34 etc.), a 2<sup>nd</sup> lateral wall (7) having an annular gap filed by a hollow sleeve member or adaptor member (10), a shaft (2) and a cutter (6) having an annular rim (5).

4. Claims 1,2,5,8,12-14,16,23 and 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schlessmann '934, who shows a head assembly having a 1<sup>st</sup> lateral wall (e.g. 13), a 1<sup>st</sup> transverse shield wall (e.g. 19), a 2<sup>nd</sup> lateral wall (e.g. 46) having an annular gap filed by a hollow sleeve member or adaptor member (e.g. 17), a coaxial adaptor wall (18), a shaft (e.g. 15) and a cutter (23) having an annular rim (22).

Art Unit: 3724

5. Claims 1,2,5,8,12-14,16,23 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lill '165, who shows a head assembly having a 1<sup>st</sup> lateral wall (e.g. 43), a 1<sup>st</sup> transverse shield wall (39), a 2<sup>nd</sup> lateral wall (vertical sidewalls of 12) having an annular gap filled by a hollow sleeve member or adaptor member (21 or 22,22), a coaxial adaptor wall (23 or 24), a shaft (e.g. 15 or 16) and a cutter (28) having an annular rim (19).

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5,8,9,12-14,16,23 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lill '165.

Lill, as set forth above, shows most of the recited limitations.

In regards to claim 3, Lill's 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> lateral walls are attached to the same transverse shield wall (39) instead of being attached to two integral transverse shield walls. However, there is no structural difference between a single transverse shield walls and two transverse shield walls that are integral with one another. The courts have long ruled that *"the unity or diversity of parts would depend more on the choice of the manufacturer, and the convenience and availability of the machines and*

Art Unit: 3724

*tools.....than on any inventive concept". See In re Lockhart, 90 USPQ 214.*

Furthermore, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known to employ one or two parts in situations such as this. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have employed two integral transverse shield walls on Lill, instead of just one transverse shield wall, since the courts have ruled this to be obvious and because it is an old equivalent known for the same purpose.

In regards to claims 4 and 9, the bearings 22,22 have a hollow cylindrical portion, a first annular adaptor plate (bottom of 22) and presumably a second annular adaptor plate (top of 22). Since the second annular adaptor plate is not explicitly drawn, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known to have such annular adaptor plates at the lateral ends of bushing for the purpose of preventing axial sliding. An example of this is the bottom annular adaptor plate on Lill's 22. If it wasn't there already, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have added a top annular adaptor plate to Lill's adaptor 22 for the purpose of preventing axial sliding.

8. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has amended the claims to recite that the first and second lateral walls are overlapping certain portions of the device. This is not seen as distinguishing over the Schlessman, Lill and Byrne references, which have lateral walls that "overlap" the recited parts.

Art Unit: 3724

Applicant states, at length, that the above references do not have certain parts, but it is not clear why these parts, as enumerated above in the rejections, don't read on Applicant's claims.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth E. Peterson whose telephone number is 703-308-2186. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:30-4:30.

Art Unit: 3724

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

kp  
13 June 2005



KENNETH E. PETERSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER